

STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 739 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

http://lachildrenscommission.org

Monday, June 18, 2012 10:00 AM

AUDIO LINK FOR THE ENTIRE MEETING. (12-2882)

Attachments: AUDIO

Present: Vice Chair Genevra Berger, Vice Chair Susan F. Friedman,

Commissioner Carol O. Biondi, Commissioner Ann E. Franzen, Commissioner Helen A. Kleinberg, Commissioner Dr. La-Doris McClaney, Commissioner Daphne Ng, Commissioner Steven M. Olivas Esq., Commissioner Sandra Rudnick, Commissioner Adelina Sorkin LCSW/ACSW and Commissioner Martha Trevino-

Powell

Excused: Chair Patricia Curry, Vice Chair Dr. Sunny Kang and

Commissioner Dr. Harriette F. Williams

Call to order. (12-2654)

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Berger at 10:05 a.m.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Introductions of June 18, 2012 Meeting attendees. (12-2655)

Self-introductions were made.

2. Approval of the June 18, 2012 Meeting Agenda. (12-2656)

On motion of Commissioner Adelina Sorkin, seconded by Commissioner Helen A. Kleinberg, unanimously carried, (Commissioners Curry, Kang, and Williams being absent), this item was approved. Commissioners McClaney and Olivas were not present during approval of this item.

3. Approval of the minutes from the meetings of May 21, 2012 and June 4, 2012. (12-2501)

On motion of Commissioner Adelina Sorkin, LCSW/ACSW, seconded by Commissioner Helen A. Kleinberg, unanimously carried, the minutes from the meeting of May 21, 2012 were approved. Commissioners McClaney and Olivas were not present during approval of this item.

On motion of Commissioner Helen A. Kleinberg, seconded by Commissioner Adelina Sorkin, LCSW/ACSW, the minutes from the meeting of June 4, 2012 were approved. Commissioners McClaney and Olivas were not present during approval of this item.

<u>Attachments:</u> SUPPORTING DOCUMENT-5/21/12

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT-6/4/12

II. REPORT

4. Chair's report for June 18, 2012 by Patricia Curry, Chair. (12-2657)

Vice Chair Berger presented a verbal report on the following:

- The next DCFS Data Dashboard meeting is scheduled for June 20, 2012 at DCFS Headquarters. Commissioner's interested in attending, please contact staff.
- Los Angeles County Probation Department and Department of Children and Family Services' 2012 Annual System Improvement Plan (SIP) Stakeholder meeting will be held, Wednesday, June 27, 2012, from 8:00 a.m. 4:00 p.m. at the Pasadena Hilton Hotel, 168 South Los Robles Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101. Continental Breakfast and Registration will take place from 8:00 a.m. 9:00 a.m. Commissioner's interested in attending, please contact staff today.

III. PRESENTATIONS

- **5.** Presentation by the Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS) and Probation on the Title IV-E Waiver.
 - Rhelda Shabazz, Deputy Director, DCFS
 - Cynthia McCoy-Miller, Administrative Deputy III, Bureau of Finance and Administration, DCFS

Crystal Huang, Departmental Finance Manager III, Fiscal Operations Division, DCFS

- Jennifer Kaufman, Director, Probation Department
- Adam Bettino, Administrative Services Manager I, Probation Department (12-2790)

Ms. Shabazz distributed a single page handout titled, Improved Safety (Outcomes) and copies of a PowerPoint presentation titled, Title IV-E Waiver Department of Children and Family Services, Title IV-E Waiver and Realignment Update Presentation, June 18, 2012. She reported the following:

 As a result of strategies funded by the Title IV-E Waiver, there was an improvement in safety and increased permanency. Children who did not have a recurrence of maltreatment increased from 93.4% to 94%.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. Shabazz stated the following:

- More detailed statistical information on safety and permanency outcomes broken down by age and by type of foster care will be provided to the Commission.
- The coaching and mentoring strategy listed on the single page handout is specific to DCFS staff. DCFS is currently piloting a project in the Compton office as part of this strategy. The Katie A. Panel has come to the Compton office to observe coaching and mentoring strategies. Pilot strategies include enhancing computer technology to assist social workers with completion of reports. The use of the iPhone is being piloted in some offices in an effort to decrease the timeframe of reporting.
- The programs listed on the single page handout are services purchased with Title IV-E Waiver funds and are an integrated effort.

The Commission expressed concern that while the single page handout listed the programs and strategies funded by the Waiver, statistical outcomes and programs outcomes that are Waiver specific were not identified in the handout.

In response to questions posed by the Commission regarding MHSA funding, Ms. Huang stated the following:

- Funds are shared with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) as part
- of a Title IV-E Waiver saving strategy. It is a mutual benefit for both DCFS and DMH. DMH finances DCFS programs as well.

Ms. McCoy-Miller stated that DCFS will continue to explore ways to utilize Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) and Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) funding.

DCFS Director Browning added that he recently became aware of the possibility of utilizing MHSA funds.

Ms. McCoy-Miller distributed a Title IV-E Waiver presentation that focused on the fiscal aspect funding has on DCFS programs with information on the following areas:

- Title IV-E Waiver Overview
- Title IV-E Waiver Background
- Title IV-E Waiver Funding
- DCFS FY 2012-2013 IV-E Waiver Budget
- Saving and Reinvestments
- Risks and Staffing Level

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. McCoy-Miller stated that the maximum slots for Wraparound funding through the waiver is 815, additional placements are funded through Katie A.

In response to questions posed by the Commission regarding the timeline on the Title IV-E Waiver, DCFS Director Browning stated that the waiver has a one year bridge that begins in approximately ten days. The waiver report is due for federal review by the end of December 2012. DCFS has been in correspondence with the state on the best method to proceed with this evaluation and with Casey Family Programs on options of getting data sooner in order to have the Waiver report prepared by the end of November 2012. There is concern that political change in administration will delay processes associated with the Waiver. DCFS is working with a consultant to assist in reviewing the data that will focus on what has been done with the Waiver and the next steps.

In a recent meeting with all of the counties, the State Director indicated that there has not been a timeline established for counties to decide whether they want participate in the Waiver. At this point only Alameda and Los Angeles County have opted in. The state is not going to require counties to make a decision until late in the fall.

The Commission requested that DCFS provide information with enough time to review prior to the meeting and agreed to arrange a future agenda date should there be questions for DCFS in regards to the material presented.

Ms. Kaufman reported the following:

Probation's strategies focused on the Department's performance in the areas of permanency, placement stability and self-sufficiency.

Increased Permanency:

Probation's reunification rate has increased significantly. The Department is now focusing on re-entry rates. Although there has been an improvement in re-entry rates since the beginning of the Waiver, there is the possibility that the record keeping was done incorrectly. The Department is now working on expanding the Department's evidence-based practices by expansion in the following areas:

- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)
- Functional Family Probation (FFP)
- Creation of an aftercare model to ensure that Probation youth transitioning home will have a Functional Family Probation Officer.
- Substance Abuse Services have been added to sequence three

Additionally, an aftercare model was created for Transitional Age Youth; currently a functional agency probation officer services all youth exiting the system.

Placement Stability:

 Expansion of Group Home Monitoring Unit was done to ensure that the Group Homes that are being referred have the services needed.

Enhanced Self-Sufficiency:

 Probation has partnered with DCFS to develop a Countywide Foster Youth Education Pilot, replicating the model that was introduced by Supervisor Molina. Expansion in after care services was done; some Independent Living Program (ILP) services are being incorporated in the aftercare services.

The Commission thanked the Probation staff for the update indicating that the information presented was very comprehensive; however, noted that data on statistical outcomes would be ideal when reporting. To that end, Mr. Bettino reported that the Probation Department will be partnering with Casey Family Programs to purchase "Save Measures" data in an effort to collect statistical placement data.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. Kaufman reported the following:

- Probation Department information will be part of the report due for Federal review in December 2012.
- Through EPSDT leveraged funds Services are provided for youth in camps as well as for those at-risk youth in the Community.

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, this item was received and filed.

<u>Attachments:</u> <u>SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - Probation</u>

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - DCFS
SUPPORTING DOCUMENT - DCFS

- **6.** Update on the DCFS Realignment.
 - Rhelda Shabazz, Deputy Director, DCFS
 - Cynthia McCoy-Miller, Administrative Deputy III, Bureau of Finance and Administration, DCFS
 - Crystal Huang, Departmental Finance Manager III, Fiscal Operations Division, DCFS (12-2798)

Ms. McCoy-Miller distributed a presentation titled, Title IV-E Waiver Department of Children and Family Services, Title IV-E Waiver and Realignment Update Presentation, June 18, 2012. She reported that the 2011 Realignment package left a significant series of implementation matters unresolved, including critical issues such as the design of the funding system and allocation of revenues among counties. Two pieces of legislation were put in place to address unresolved issues. Details on the legislation were included in the PowerPoint presentation (copy on file).

DCFS remains vigilant on the provided framework for counties to receive 40% out of the growth funds in terms of the \$200 million capped allocation.

Ms. Huang is a member County Welfare Director's Association of California County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA) Workgroup and keeps DCFS well apprised of the disbursements of these funds.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. Shabazz reported the following:

- DCFS does not anticipate any challenges or changes to services that are currently provided under the Realignment. Based on the Realignment, no programs are anticipated to be cut; however, no added or increase in programs are anticipated either. DCFS remains very conservative.
- No allocation has been received from the state to address the THP Plus Foster Care component; therefore, the existing THP Plus Program remains the same.
- DCFS currently has an 84 bed allocation under its THP Plus existing program.
- AB 12 yielded \$5.5 million in FY 2011-12; these funds are outside of the Waiver money and result from the Realignment. It is anticipated that in FY's 2012-13 through 2014-5 additional funding will also be available.

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, this item was received and filed.

Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

IV. DISCUSSION

- 7. Discussion by Commission and Casey Family Programs on National Trends and Data on Relative Care:
 - Ricardo Hernandez, Strategic Consultant/Analyst, Casey Family Programs
 - Wendy DeTata, Strategic Consultant, Casey Family Programs Commission (12-2803)

Ms. De Tata reported the following:

- In January-February 2012, Casey Family Programs (Casey) held five convenings all over the Country to discuss the new Waiver authorization and give information to the different states and counties. At convenings, it was noted that 20+ counties could be part of the new Waiver.
- California State was separate and different because moving forward with the new Waiver authorization is based on the Waiver that is already in place.
- Based on the convenings, Casey has put together a Waiver implementation Workgroup to provide technical assistance to various counties and States all over the Country on the various issues surrounding the Waiver.
- In California, Casey is working directly with the State and individually with its counties to provide different kinds of technical assistance on an as needed basis.
- Currently, in northern California 20 counties are working together to decide if they want to be part of the Waiver and to brainstorm on what they want to do if they enter the Waiver. Casey is providing technical assistance that includes data analysis, information about evidencedbased practices, best practices, and strategies on what the Waiver can do for the respective counties.
- Casey is actively working with Alameda and Los Angeles Counties, on the Waiver next steps.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Ms. De Tata reported:

 The focus of most counties is not in reducing caseloads, but rather the trend for most of the counties is permanency, child well-being, stability, and safety, and Los Angeles County is moving in that direction.

Director Browning noted that finances are an extremely important component in the determination by many counties in moving forward in joining the new Waiver. DCFS waits on other Counties' approaches; however; is being conservative in making a determination related to next steps. The goals and objectives of Los Angeles County are also consistent with other counties' approaches. Director Browning is hopeful that other counties will enter the Waiver soon.

Mr. Hernandez provided an overview of national trends related to kinship care on child safety, placement stability, permanency, family connections, well-being, mental health and juvenile delinquency, and kinship caregiver challenges, and reported the following concluding findings.

- Kinship placements tend to be more stable than foster care placements and there are less placement disruptions.
- Children in kinship care remain in care longer, take longer to reunify with birth parents, and are less likely to be adopted than those in foster care.
- Children placed with relatives are more likely to be placed with siblings and maintain relationships with birth parents and relatives.
- Children in kinship care are more likely to remain in their community of origin and maintain connections to cultural identity.
- Children in kinship care are more likely to remain in the same school and benefit from their school support system.
- There is little evidence of differences in mental health outcomes between children in kinship care and foster care.
- Kinship caregivers tend to be older, single, have lower incomes, educational attainment, and have more health issues. They also tend to receive fewer services and trainings than foster parents.
- Kinship placements tend to be more stable.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Casey added the following:

- No data on the effects long-term care has on childrens' mental health is available; however, Casey will be looking at this data for findings.
- There is uncertainty as to how much of the data presented captures California trends; however, if the Commission wishes to receive information relevant to LA County, Casey would be willing to conduct the research that is more California focused and bring back the information.

 There is uncertainty as to whether relative care is the best option for placement; however, based on data gathered it is one of the first options considered.

Mr. Hernandez also advised the Commission to send questions related to the information presented and agreed to follow up with answers.

Director Browning noted that there is uncertainty whether relative care is the best option; however, DCFS does consider this a first choice when determining placement.

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, this item was received and filed.

<u>Attachments:</u> <u>SUPPORTING DOCUMENT</u>

SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

V. DCFS DIRECTOR'S REPORT

8. DCFS Director's Report by Philip Browning, Director, DCFS for June 18, 2012. (12-2672)

Director Browning presented a verbal report adding the following:

- DCFS held a conference about a week or ten days ago with relative caregivers offering various workshops addressing the needs of relative caregivers. DCFS is currently trying to identify the needs of the relative caregivers and working diligently to address their needs.
- DCFS is working diligently with Casey Family Program and a group of experts to update and/or redevelop the DCFS Policy Manual, as this is an important initiative that the Board of Supervisors and other stakeholders such as the unions want for the Department. Director Browning currently met with Andrew Bridge, Executive Director, of the Child Welfare Initiative, who concurs that a redevelopment of the DCFS Policy is key for the Department. Although the DCFS Policy has a search engine, it is extensive and not easy to understand or research.
- DCFS has been audited by the State of California regarding overstays at the Emergency Response Command Post (ERCP). As a result, a report was requested by the Board of Supervisors through (Board Order No. 75-A of 05/15/12) to address this issue. The Children's Village at the Medical Center created by Dr. Astrid Heger was identified as a feasible center. The Village's main component is the Violence Intervention Program (VIP) that provides medical, forensic, mental health, social, and legal services. DCFS will be presenting the report to the Board tomorrow, June 9, 2012. Village will be used for children ages, 10 and under.

DCFS will be conducting security screening as many youth have begun to use the ERCP as a social hall; DCFS is working to identify a new center for the youth also.

The Commission inquired whether Commission members could visit the ERCP. Director Browning indicated that Commissioners could visit and arrange the visit through the Commission's DCFS liaison.

After discussion, by common consent and there being no objection, this item was received and filed.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

9. Announcements for the meeting of June 18, 2012. (12-2660)

There were none.

Matters Not Posted

10. Matters not posted on the agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Commission, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (12-2658)

There were none.

Public Comment

Opportunity for members of the public to address the Commission on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Commission. (12-2659)

There were none.

<u>Adjournment</u>

12. Adjournment for the meeting of June 18, 2012. (12-2661)

The meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Berger at 12:00 p.m.